"My name is Christian, my surname is Catholic." – St. Pacian

INTERDVM

"Increase our faith." – Luke 17:5

A journal published now and then by Patrick Henry Omlor

Box R, Menlo Park, Calif. 94025 MAY 31, 1971 Issue No. 7

THE ROBBER CHURCH

(Part 2)

The Law of "Little by Little"

Veteran revolutionaries and conspirators know that the law of life is the law of gradualism. Sudden, unexpected and radical changes are never accepted willingly by "the people." The only reliable technique, psychologically, -- that is, short of physical violence -- is that of "little by little," starting with the foot in the door. Prior to the enforcement of some drastic change there are nearly always some minor and related changes leading up to it. Often some hints and suggestions, made publicly, concerning the possibility of the intended change serve as a sounding board, and these are known as "trial balloons." The theory is to "send it up" and see whether or not anyone bothers to shoot at it. This determines the pulse of "the people" or the "trend of public opinion," and if there is no shooting at the trial balloon then it is considered safe to go ahead with the innovation. After all has been accomplished and a respectable waiting period has been observed, candid remarks can be made, such as that of Cardinal Heenan's: "If all the changes had been introduced together you would have been shocked." (The Tablet, London, Oct. 11, 1969, p.1010).

A valuable feature of this technique of gradualism is that at each new step a certain precedent is established, one which at a later time can be referred to as a support for the more advanced changes. Thus, after the serious and invalidating mutilations of the Mass had already been made, it was of no avail to point out to the "new robbers" the decree Quo Primum or to insist upon the unchangeable nature of the Canon of the Mass, for they could readily refer to good Pope John who, by personally inserting the name of St. Joseph in the Canon, had been the very first person ever to change it. This argument, of course, is supposed to be "unanswerable."

Planned confusion is part of the program of the Robber Church. Nowadays, in truth, no one of the bamboozled "People of God" knows what to expect next. The conditioning for change has been so thorough that "the people" will accept anything. A major success of the Robber Church, one achieved quite early in the game, was to accustom the "People of God" to the idea of "the mystery" of the Church, a Church in flux, a Church always changing to adapt itself to the needs of the "modern world," a Church on the move. Why do you think we hear so often the words "Pilgrim Church"? What, after all, is the definition of pilgrim? The continual journeying after novelties is the mark of a frivolous mind, but at this point even among the erstwhile more solid and faithful members of the "People of God" the itch for change has spread like a most contagious infection. The Robber Church banked on this happening, so that with the passage of time the potential opposition would be kept to a minimum. The program, viewed as a whole, is geared to condition the entire Church, from the highest ranking prelate to the lowliest layperson, to accept the brand new Church, no questions asked. Call it what you will: the Robber Church, the Ecumenical Church, the WCC, the Universal Church of "Operation '76," etc. Regardless of its name, it is the apostate Church of Antichrist. This is what St. Pius X warned of and foretold: "Their real aims, their plots, the line they are following are well known to all of you, ... What they propose is a UNIVERSAL APOSTASY, worse still than the one which threatened the century of Charles (Borromeo), worse from the fact that it creeps insidious and hidden in the very veins of the Church ... (O)f both revolts the ways are hidden and darksome... Truly a spectacle full of sadness for the present and of menace for the future." (Encyclical Editae Saepe, 1910).

Living daily in this chaotic "anything goes" atmosphere, a person's perceptual powers get dimmed, so that eventually the obfuscated mind simply cannot discern legitimate change from illegitimate change. (Of course, there is also most probably a certain failure to cooperate with grace.) Admittedly, many of the robbers' changes were, strictly speaking, legitimate; that is, the true Church would have had the power and the right to make them. However, the true Church, guided and enlightened by the Holy Ghost, would never have actually attempted such suicide. Few today, among the hierarchy and the clergy, can distinguish -- or care to distinguish, for it is "academic" -- between those things which the Catholic Church has the power to change and those things which even the Church and the Pope are forbidden to touch, for example, the substance of

the Sacraments (see Has The Church The Right?, by P.H. Omlor, Athanasius Press, 311 N. 4th Ave., Brainerd,Minn. 56401, 25¢). Later on in the future -- this is coming, for the omens are unmistakably clear -- the "Catholic Church" will join the World Council of Churches. The time was, not too long ago, when every Catholic would have understood that such is impossible and is tantamount to apostasy. All those of the "People of God" who, when the time comes, have not yet realized the existence and true nature of the Robber Church will be led, unwittingly or not, on to the path of universal apostasy foretold by St. Pius X. For it will not be and cannot be the true Catholic Church which will be joining or "working with" the World Council of Churches.

It is important in the plans of the Robber Church to make it seem as though the Catholic Church has contradicted Herself, and then to treat this lightly, as if such contradictions are normal, routine and to be expected. That the true Catholic Church cannot contradict Herself can not be repeated too often. In these instances of "contradiction" what is really happening is that the Robber Church is at it again, laying waste to Catholicism; of course, this is what the game is all about. In all of this, what is perhaps the gravest danger to many Catholics is their failure to recognize that it is the Robber Church which is contradicting the true Church, and not at all a case of self-contradiction. But, when it seems to them that the Church is reversing Herself continually, this alone tends to shake and seriously undermine their faith.

The Official Policy Is: Insanity

Father John Courtney Murray, S.J. (now deceased) was a notable expert at Vatican II, and, specifically, it was the Decree on Religious Freedom upon which he exercised his talents and influence to their fullest. As peritus and insider at Vatican II, especially as regards this decree, Fr. Murray is most capable of giving us some valuable insights. In his commentary on this decree (pp.672-4 of The Documents of Vatican II, Gen. Editor W. M. Abbott, S.J.), Father Murray admits, implicitly at least, that this decree conflicts with the existing doctrine of the Catholic Church. He claims, first of all, that this decree's "content is properly doctrinal," and then he apologizes thus: "In all honesty it must be admitted that the Church is late in acknowledging the validity of the principle (of religious freedom)." The Church "is late" on this simply because it wasn't until just fairly lately that the subversives gained sufficient power to start calling the signals. "In any event," he continues, "the document is a significant event in the history of the Church. It was, of course, the most controversial document of the whole Council, largely because it raised with sharp emphasis the issue that lay continually below the surface of all the conciliar debates --the issue of the development of doctrine." Does it need pointing out that in the Robbers' argot the "development" of doctrine means the corrupting of it? "The notion of development," states Fr. Murray, "not the notion of religious freedom, was the real sticking-point for many of those who opposed the Declaration even to the end."

Sticking-point indeed! So openly and flagrantly in opposition to the teachings promulgated by His Holiness Pius IX is this decree, that in "Progressive" circles it came to be known as "the de-Stalinization of Pius IX." Though typically irreverent, this label is wholly accurate, because it is impossible to reconcile the doctrine in this document with the Syllabus of Errors of Pope Pius IX or with his encyclical Quanta Cura. The "development" of doctrine here amounts to a change in course of a full 180°. Father John Courtney Murray, the peritus, the insider on this particular decree, now admits (p.673) that: "The course of the development between the Syllabus of Errors (1864) and Dignitatis Humanae Personae (i. e., Decree on Religious Liberty) STILL REMAINS TO BE EXPLAINED BY THEOLOGIANS (emphasis added)." "Theologians" will succeed in explaining a 180° turn as a "development," and get away with it, only when the whole world will have gone insane.

Let us investigate just one of these "real sticking-points." In Quanta Cura (Dec.8, 1864), the Supreme Teacher Pius IX declared: "And, from this wholly false idea of social organization they do not fear to foster that erroneous opinion, especially fatal to the Catholic Church and to the salvation of souls, called by Our predecessor of recent memory, Gregory XVI, insanity; namely, that 'liberty of conscience and worship is the proper right of every man, and should be proclaimed and asserted by law in every correctly established society...'". "The Synod further declares," --and now we are quoting Vatican II's Decree on Religious Liberty-- "that the right to religious freedom has its foundation in the very dignity of the human person... This right of the human person to religious freedom is to be recognized in the constitutional law whereby society is governed. Thus it is to become a civil right."

And so, the Robber Church through Vatican II formally teaches that the right to religious freedom "is to be recognized in the constitutional law whereby society is governed." Diametrically opposed is the Catholic Church, which, through Her Supreme Pontiff Pius IX (who cited his predecessor Gregory XVI), declares that to hold that liberty of worship "should be proclaimed and asserted by law" is INSANITY! This opinion, moreover, is "especially fatal to the Catholic Church and to the salvation of souls." As a result, the officially stated policy of the Robber Church is clearly insane. "We now submit this text for your consideration," said Bishop Emile De Smedt in introducing this Decree. "It is evident that certain quotations from the Popes, because of a difference of words, can be put in opposition to our schema. ... The whole world is waiting for this decree...this liberating doctrine on religious liberty!" (Speech Nov.19, 1963).

Newspeak : The Official Language

Speaking and writing with studied ambiguity and with deliberate vagueness is a trademark of Masonic publications and utterances. The "Universal Declaration of Human Rights," drafted by the United Nations and adopted in 1948, had as its prototype and model the "Declaration of the Rights of Man" of 1789, which laid down for France its Masonic, Naturalistic (and ultimately atheistic) philosophy and principles of society. (It is not our present purpose to go into the nightmare of bloody horrors, blasphemies, immorality and utter Godlessness -- all stemming from such principles -- that the French Revolution was.) Referring to this last-mentioned document, Father Denis Fahey remarks: "Of course, there is a certain vagueness about some of the formulae. This is a well-known Masonic trick to deceive the unwary." --(The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World, p.44). When such ambiguous and vague language is employed systematically, as is the case with the Freemasons and also in the official decrees and pronouncements of the Robber Church, the result can be appropriately called Newspeak (to borrow a term from novelist George Orwell). Just as Latin is the universal language of the Catholic Church, Newspeak is the universal language of the Robber Church.

A singular advantage of Newspeak is that it is readily spoken in English, French, Spanish or German, etc., (i.e., in any of the standard languages), and thus it is fitly called a universal language. Often the hearer of Newspeak is misled into thinking he actually understands what is being said, but nobody really understands Newspeak. Or, perhaps it is more correct to say that everybody in a way "understands" it, for Newspeak says all "good things" to all men. So masterfully ambiguous is it, that men of the most varied, even diametrically opposed, opinions can read or hear exactly the same thing in Newspeak, and all be completely pleased. That is why not only Catholics, but also Protestants, Masons, Unitarians, Jews (and probably even the pagan Pygmies of Africa too) all are able, immediately, to find the decrees of Vatican II, for example, completely wonderful and meaningful and relevant. Such is the awe-inspiring nature of Newspeak. It is a breakthrough in "ecumenism." Probably everyone who is reading this can think of some friend or acquaintance who, for the most part, is "solid" and orthodox, but who, somewhere along the line, has run afoul of Newspeak and "understood" it, and is therefore now all mixed up on certain things. Such is the dangerous nature of Newspeak.

We define "Newspeak in action" as the saying of one thing followed, as soon as possible, by the doing of its exact opposite. Pope John XXIII in his opening speech at Vatican II spoke about honoring the Council of Trent and changing nothing: "...the renewed, serene, and tranquil adherence to all the teaching of the Church in its entirety and preciseness, as it still shines forth in the Acts of the Council of Trent and the First Vatican Council." We have all witnessed how the "teaching of the Church in its entirety" was so valorously upheld in the Vatican II decisions, and in what great esteem the Council of Trent was, and is, held by the Robber Church. Their Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy actually had the effrontery to speak about "preserving Latin," while the Robbers knew full well that the decision had already been signed, sealed and delivered to see to it that it would be preserved, at best, only in Mason jars.

If one studies carefully the decrees of Vatican II he will observe the facile manner in which two principal techniques of Newspeak are used. These are the "suppressio veri" and the "suggestio falsi." (Father George Duggan, S. M., explains these tricks in his book Hans Kueng and Reunion.) Suppressio veri, the suppression of the truth, involves the stating of something which, if taken exactly literally, is in itself true (and cannot be challenged on this score), but at the same time an important and essential aspect or part of the picture is suppressed. In ordinary everyday parlance this is known as the "half truth."

In suggestio falsi something which is not true (i.e., an actual falsehood) is suggested or implied, but the falsehood is not actually stated. The Decree on Ecumenism is replete with the suggestio falsi. The following passage from this Decree will suffice to illustrate the suggestio falsi: "Christ summons the Church, as she goes her pilgrim way, to that continual reformation of which she always has need, insofar as she is an institution of men here on earth. Therefore, if the influence of events or of the times has led to deficiencies in conduct, in Church discipline, or even in the formulation of doctrine (which must be carefully distinguished from the deposit of faith itself), these should be appropriately rectified at the proper moment." This does not claim that there have been such deficiencies, but it suggests, falsely, that there might have been. "If," it says, if such deficiencies have existed, "these should be appropriately rectified." Even the "Liberal" Father Walter Abbott, commenting on this sentence (op. cit., p.350), rubs his eyes in astonishment: "It is remarkable, indeed, for an Ecumenical Council to admit the possible deficiency of previous doctrinal formulations." Would a genuine Council, aided by the Holy Ghost, ever say anything of the kind, namely, that Holy Mother Church might have been deficient in the formulation of doctrine?

"Doing Something" for St. Joseph

On December 8, 1962, through the influence of the then nascent Robber Church, the Canon of the Mass, the ancient Roman Canon, was officially destroyed. With the insertion of the name of St. Joseph into it, a change which went into effect on that day, the "Canon" of the Mass ceased to be a canon. Derived from a Greek word meaning a rigid rod or rule, kanon, it is a thing inflexible and unchangeable. By definition, therefore, the Canon of the Mass is unchangeable.

Due to the emphasis many of us have recently placed upon the decree Quo Primum (1570) of Pope St. Pius V, which decree forbade in perpetuity any additions or changes whatsoever in the Roman Missal, under the penalty of incurring "the wrath of Almighty God, and of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul," there are some who now harbor the incorrect notion that the Roman Canon dates only from the year of Quo Primum, 1570. In truth this Canon, which St. Pius V took the formidable measures of Quo Primum to protect from change, actually is substantially the same as that used by the Roman (or Western) Church from the very beginning; that is to say, it quite probably dates from apostolic times. It is believed that St. Gregory the Great (died A.D. 604) perhaps rearranged the order of certain prayers in the Canon; and this much is an absolute certainty: "Since the seventh century our Canon has remained unchanged." (Cath. Encyc., v.III, p. 256). In The Question of Anglican Ordinations Discussed (London, Burns & Oates, 1873), the esteemed author E. E. Estcourt, then the Canon of St. Chad's Cathedral, Birmingham, gives the following account:

"What, then, is the Canon of the Mass? and what claims has it on our respect? Let us hear Sir William Palmer, as a writer whose testimony is beyond suspicion. After stating various facts and arguments on the subject, he says: 'Combining these circumstances together, there seems nothing unreasonable in thinking that the Roman liturgy, as used in the time of Gregory the Great, may have existed from a period of the most remote antiquity; and perhaps there are nearly as good reasons for referring its original composition to the Apostolic age, as there are in the case of the great Oriental liturgy.'

"The care taken to preserve the Canon in its original authentic form we learn from other writers. 'In ancient times,' says Muratori, 'although the liturgy of the Roman Mass was observed generally in the churches of Italy, France, Germany, Britain, and other countries, yet there was no small variety in their Missals; but this did not affect the substance of the mystery, or the chief and essential rites of the Mass. The difference ran in adding collects, sequences, and special feasts, which each Bishop might insert in his own missal. But to change the sacred words of the Canon was a crime.' By the laws of Charlemagne it was ordered that only men of full age should be employed to transcribe it; and the Councils of York and Oxford in the twelfth century decreed that the Archdeacon should examine in every church whether there were errors or defects in the Canon, either by the faults of transcribers or the books being old. Always too the Canon was written in different and larger characters than the rest, and sometimes in gold letters throughout, as an offering of reverence." (End of the quotation from Estcourt, pp. 279-280, emphasis added.)

Since the apostolic origin of the Roman Canon is not a proven fact, let us consider only that period of history during which we are absolutely certain that it underwent no change whatever, not even a rearrangement of the prayers, namely, from the year 604 until the year 1962. From the time of Pope St. Gregory I up to the time of John XXIII there were one hundred ninety-seven (197) validly chosen sovereign pontiffs. Of these, twenty-three are venerated as saints and at least another five have been beatified. Neglecting the possible exceptions of some very few of these 197 popes who might possibly have been a little less than devout, we can safely claim that they all had a genuine devotion to St. Joseph, the chaste spouse of the Mother of God. Some of these popes bestowed signal honors upon St. Joseph. For example: Pope Gregory XV extended his feast to the universal Church; Pius IX in 1870 proclaimed him Protector of the universal Church; in 1937 the encyclical Divini Redemptoris, explaining and condemning Communism, was issued by Pope Pius XI on March 19th, the feastday of St. Joseph, and in its concluding paragraphs the Pontiff said: "We place the vast campaign of the Church against world Communism under the standard of St. Joseph, her mighty Protector." As a spiritual counter-move against the hallowed May Day of the Communists, a "feastday" they inherited directly from the conspiratorial Illuminati (see Encyc. Britannica, vol.xiv, p.320, 11th ed.), Pope Pius XII instituted on May 1st the feast of St. Joseph the Workman.

As devoted to St. Joseph as were these 197 popes of this period spanning 1358 years (fully 70% of the total lifetime of the Church thus far!), not one of them ever so much as dreamed of "honoring" him by laying hands on the sacred immutable Canon of the Mass. In point of fact -- and this is history -- in the year 1815 there was indeed a short-lived movement afoot which attempted to get the name of St. Joseph inserted into the Canon. This attempt (the first ancestor of the same identical movement circa 1962, which turned out to be successful), needless to say, was doomed to failure under the vigilant eyes of Pope Pius VII. In an 'Urbis et Orbis' decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, dated Sept. 16, 1815, the request was tersely and officially denied: "Negative quoad additionem nominis S. Josephi Sponsi B.M.V. in Canone." (See p.66, V.III, of Gardellini's compilation, 1857, #4520.) On the eve of the Vatican Council (1870) the same campaign was once again renewed, and once again the vigilant Shepherd of Rome (this time it was Pius IX) turned thumbs down on it. Apparently these earlier popes understood not only the meaning of the word canon, but also the awful warning of Quo Primum. And they also doubtlessly were not ignorant of how the conspiring enemies of the Church will often utilize seemingly "good" causes as opening wedges to attain, ultimately, nefarious ends.

What happened very early during Vatican II is only too well known. In a nutshell: what no one of his 197 immediate predecessors had done, and two very astute ones had outright rejected, John XXIII carried out. An account is given on pp. 44-6 of The Rhine Flows Into the Tiber, by

Rev. Ralph M. Wiltgen, S.V.D., Hawthorn Books, 1967. In mid-March 1962, Pope John received six volumes of signed petitions, including signatures of cardinals, patriarchs, bishops and archbishops, asking for the name of St. Joseph to be inserted into the Canon of the Mass. "While examining these signatures, Pope John said, 'Something will be done for St. Joseph.'" (p.46). On Oct. 30, Auxiliary Bishop Ildefonso Sansierra of San Juan de Cuyo, Argentina, released the first trial balloon when, from the Council floor, he expressed the hope that the inclusion of the name of St. Joseph in the Canon of the Mass "would not be forgotten." (p.45). There was not a bit of noticeable resistance to this first trial balloon. And so, on Nov. 5, "the same request was made at great length by Bishop Albert Cousineau of Cap Haitien, Haiti, ... who asked that 'the name of Blessed Joseph, Spouse of the Blessed Virgin Mary, be introduced into the Mass wherever the name of the Blessed Virgin Mary is mentioned.'" (pp. 44-5). Still no opposition. Eight days later, on Nov. 13, the Cardinal Secretary of State made a special announcement that the Holy Father had decided to insert the name of St. Joseph in the Canon of the Mass, immediately after the name of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and that the change would go into effect almost immediately, that is, on Dec. 8th. "Cardinal Montini later described this unexpected (??!) move as 'a surprise for the Council from the Pope.'" (p.45).

As stated earlier, the Roman Canon was destroyed on December 8, 1962; but only "officially," for there will always be some loyal priests who will adhere to it in its integrity. What the Robber Church has is no 'canon' at all. In fact it eschews the very word canon; since 1968 it has had four so-called "Eucharistic Prayers," none of which is a true canon. Once the inflexible, unchangeable rigid rule, the Roman Canon, was changed -- in the Robber Church version of it --, it ceased, by definition, to be a canon for them. And the foot was in the door. But little time elapsed before the avalanche of changes came in the "canon," including an "aggiornamentoed" and spurious "consecration formula" in most of the various vernacular versions of it.

One cannot impugn the motives of all of those persons who petitioned for this innovation, for many of them undoubtedly acted from motives of sincere devotion to St. Joseph. Neither can one judge the intentions of Pope John, especially since his aged brain was probably then being fed many an idea pre-programmed by his trusted advisors. But all these devotees of St. Joseph were woefully ignorant of history, and of the true designs of those working behind the scenes. Where, by the way, are these pious devotees of St. Joseph today? Why do we hear no outcries from them? The only purpose of the sinister parties of influence, who secretly steered this project to success, was to launch the destruction of the Mass. What they needed was the opening wedge to get to the sacred and immutable Canon, a feat never before accomplished. They had no interest in St. Joseph then, and they still have none! Now, how can such an "outlandish" charge be proved? Quite easily; and here is the tell-tale evidence. If their devotion to St. Joseph is so conspicuous then why is it that in three out of four —75%— of their new Eucharistic Prayers the name of St. Joseph is conspicuously absent?? Have you heard any outcries about this from these "devotees" of St. Joseph?? No indeed; paying honor to St. Joseph wasn't it at all! And there are some who, in eternity, will more than likely pay dearly for their mockery of him.

The Sabotage Is Common Knowledge

Thus far in this series on The Robber Church, certain passages from the decrees of Vatican II have been cited in order to show that that Council overthrew the prior traditional teaching of the Catholic Church. No honest observer of the current scene will deny the reality of the existence of the Robber Church; but some perhaps would object to going so far as to reject Vatican II and to attribute its achievements to the Robbers rather than to the Holy Ghost. In effect, then, the question reduces to this: Whose property is Vatican II? the Catholic Church's or the Robber Church's?

In Interdum #6, two specific teachings of Vatican II were cited, which, we claimed and attempted to demonstrate, are at variance with the true Church's teaching; to wit: allowing non-Catholic sects an "equal footing" with the true Church in theological discussions; and the new doctrine, in violation of Canon Law and the natural law, permitting and encouraging worship in common (communicatio in sacris). In this present issue, the "insane" doctrine contained in the Decree on Religious Freedom was examined, and it was seen to be a manifest contradiction of the true Magisterium. These are not merely "isolated" instances, nor are they excerpts "quoted out of context." The whole animus of the Decree on Ecumenism (just for example) is pernicious. In Mortalium Animos, His Holiness Pius XI, in referring to the very things taught in this Decree, said: "They presuppose the erroneous view that all religions are more or less good and praiseworthy... Those who hold such a view not only are in error; they distort the true idea of religion, and thus reject it, falling gradually into naturalism and atheism. To favor this opinion, therefore, and to encourage such undertakings is tantamount to abandoning the religion revealed by God."

Everything in the Decree on Ecumenism fosters these fatal and erroneous beliefs. The reader is invited to refer to the first full paragraph on p. 3 of Interdum #6, for some specific examples, and, of course, consulting the Decree itself will reveal many more similar instances which show how the teachings of that Council regard non-Catholic sects as at least "more or less good and praiseworthy." If they are supposedly "capable of giving access to the community of salvation," and are actually, as stated in one place, "a means of salvation," then who

can gainsay that they are at least more or less good and praiseworthy? Similarly, we have seen how readily the eminent authority Father John Courtney Murray acknowledged the difficulty of explaining the so-called "development" of doctrine contained in the Decree on Religious Freedom.

Among the "Progressives" (whose leaders planned it that way) the fact that the Decree on Ecumenism contains an overall doctrine that clashes head-on with Mortalium Animos is common knowledge. First let us hear from Werner Becker, a European authority who was hand-picked to write the account of "The History of the Decree on Ecumenism" for the comprehensive four-volume study entitled Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II, (originally published in German, and now available in English from Burns & Oates, London). In beginning his history, Becker states: "(B)ut setbacks (to ecumenism) followed, both in the form of the encyclical Mortalium Animos (1928), and also in 1948 and 1954, when Catholic observers were forbidden to take part in the assemblies of the World Council of Churches at Amsterdam and Evanston." (Vol. II, pp. 1-2). "This was how the encyclical Mortalium Animos had seen the ecumenical situation, and the new title (i.e., of the Decree on Ecumenism) is a clear rejection of this point of view." (Becker, op. cit., p.38). Mortalium Animos is thus merely another "point of view."

Johannes Feiner, selected to write the actual commentary on this Decree for the same opus, says similarly: "The content and tone of this evaluation (in the Decree on Ecumenism) are in marked contrast to the encyclical Mortalium Animos of Pius XI (6 January 1928)." (op.cit., p. 60). Father Walter Abbott, an American, in like vein: "The Decree on Ecumenism supersedes various preconciliar directives (e.g., the June 5, 1948, monitum and the Dec. 20, 1949 instruction of the Holy Office) and some sections of the Code of Canon Law." (Documents of Vatican II, p.342).

To round out our discussion and savor it with a bit of "ecumenism," let us now hear from two non-Catholic authorities. Says Dr. Samuel McCrea Cavert: "The significance of the Decree (on Ecumenism) stands out vividly when it is read side by side with the encyclical Mortalium Animos of 1928 and the Monitum of the Holy Office in 1948. These represented such an isolated aloofness that the door appeared to be closed against any effective dialogue between Roman Catholics and non-Roman Christians. Today the door is wide open." (Documents, p.367). Dr. Cavert is a former General Secretary of the National Council of Churches, and he "had a leading part in both the formation of the National Council of Churches and the World Council of Churches." (Documents, p.744). Concerned loyal Catholics, incidentally, would benefit immensely from doing the same thing; namely, reading the Decree on Ecumenism "side by side with the encyclical Mortalium Animos," and thereby seeing how "vivid" the betrayal is. Lastly, Dr. Oscar Cullmann, a Protestant observer at the Council, praised the Decree on Ecumenism in these words: "This is more than the opening of a door; new ground has been broken. No Catholic document has ever spoken of non-Catholic Christians in this way." (Documents, p.338).

By citing specific concrete examples of these reversals and contradictions Interdum is doing nothing more than proving that these "Progressive" experts are correct. For good reasons the "Progressives" themselves do not get quite so specific, lest the "People of God" should wake up to what really happened at Vatican II. Imagine Father John Courtney Murray, for example, broadcasting the fact, citing chapter and verse, that the doctrine taught in the Decree on Religious Freedom is the precise doctrine that the Magisterium earlier labeled "insanity." Why, then, do these "Progressive" experts even advert at all to Vatican II's contradictions of the authentic Magisterium? For several reasons:

(1) To create the impression that, despite the "self-contradiction," we needn't worry, because it is perfectly normal for the Church to reverse Herself on doctrinal matters. This, of course, is in fact an impossibility. But the seeming reversal serves to undermine the faith of the average, not-too-well-informed Catholic. (2) To take care of sidetracking most persons from bothering to look too deeply into the previous (true) teaching of the Church. If Father X. Pert has already brilliantly pointed out the fact that discrepancies do exist -- but not the actual discrepancies themselves (they are far too telling!) --, and has reassured us that everything is all right and "normal," then who cares what the "old outdated" teaching was, now that we have the "new" one? (3) To be able to claim, in the event that at some future time someone should call attention to these reversals, "Well, we all knew that Vatican II was doing it, and, in fact, we even mentioned it at the time. None of the really knowledgable theologians worried about it, so why are you worrying now?"

A Bit O' Truth Doth Not Sound Doctrine Make

In our brief study of heresy in Interdum #1 ("Insights Into Heresy," Jan. 6, 1970), we saw that heresy always comes cloaked in the garb of orthodoxy. Heretical treatises, tracts, dissertations, sermons, etc., are always mixtures of sound doctrine and poisonous error, and the reasons behind this modus operandi were discussed. Consequently, we are certainly not going to find the decrees of Vatican II literally reeking with heresy. Far from it! On the other hand, the danger is that one might get misled by all the "good" things contained in these decrees. In truth, Vatican II taught not a single doctrine that we are bound to believe, which we were not already bound to believe because of previous pronouncements of the authentic Magisterium. And, moreover, in every such instance the teaching of the true Magisterium had been set down far more clearly and forcibly.

One should not be able to find a single statement -- nay, a single sentence -- in any decree of any genuine Council, that cannot stand up on its own two feet and be cited or quoted alone (regardless of any so-called "context") and convey nothing but a true and orthodox meaning. Such is the care and precision with which the true Church always words Her pronouncements. As a result, the ambiguous or questionable, or even heretical, doctrines of Vatican II cannot be presumed to be not heretical just because somewhere else in the same decree, or in another decree, reasonably orthodox-sounding versions can be found. Consider the following example:

On p. 196 of Dr. Martin Luther's Small Catechism (Concordia Publishers, 1943) we find this question: "301. Are bread and wine changed into the body and blood of Christ?". The answer given is: "Bread and wine are not changed into the body and blood of Christ; for the Bible expressly declares that bread and wine are still present in the Sacrament." This is heresy; it is Luther's doctrine of "consubstantiation." But, let us examine "the context" of this question in Dr. Luther's Catechism. The two questions and their answers surrounding this one, the one just before and the one after, are in perfect accord with orthodox Catholic teaching. Thus, the answer to #302 is: "Christ gives us Christians His body and His blood to eat and to drink." This seems, almost, to contradict what was said in #301, viz., that the bread and the wine are not changed into the body and blood of Christ. And the answer to #300 includes this: "D. Because no man has the right to change the meaning of a divine institution and testament." (It is unnecessary to quote the entire, somewhat lengthy, four-part answer to #300.) Now, just because #300 and #302 are all right, does this mean that #301 (which teaches consubstantiation) must be considered as probably orthodox, and must be reviewed in "the context" of the other two answers before making a judgment on whether or not it is heresy?

If one knows Luther's ideas on the Eucharist, he realizes that the whole animus of his doctrine is perverted, despite parts of it that might sound "good." Similarly, the animus of Vatican II -- so evident from its very fruits! -- is "Copyright Robber Church."

The Will Of "The People"

To try to justify their every subversive machination, the Robbers consult their catalogue of phony pretexts, cliches and specious "reasons": returning to "primitive practices," restoring "simplicity" to the liturgy, implementing their "new insights" into the meanings of certain Scriptural passages, making the pilgrim Church relevant to modern times. Though all laden with duplicity, the one about how "the people wanted the changes" is a naked barefaced lie. Granted that on an average day at Vatican II there was as much deceit, intrigue, subversion and fraud afoot as there is on an average day at the U.N., nevertheless on occasion a "Progressive" would come out with the undisguised truth. Take, for example, the utterly candid remarks of Bishop William Duschak of the Philippines, made at a press conference on Nov. 5, 1962. The following account is quoted from pp. 38-9 of Wiltgen, op. cit. (with emphasis added) :

"'My idea,' he (Duschak) said, 'is to introduce an ecumenical Mass, stripped wherever possible of historical accretions ..., using language and gestures that are understandable.'... Bishop Duschak did not accept the conventional reasons for keeping the Canon of the Mass intact. 'If men in centuries gone by,' he said, 'were able to choose and create Mass rites, why should not the greatest of all ecumenical councils be able to do so? Why should it not be possible to ordain that a new Mass formula be drawn up with all due reverence, one that is suited to, desired and understood by modern man...?' ... (T)he rite, form, language, and gestures would be accommodated to our modern age. ... The entire Mass, moreover, should be said aloud, in the vernacular, and facing the people. 'I believe it is also likely that if the world receives such an ecumenical form of Eucharistic celebration...etc. ...' Asked whether his proposal originated with the people he served, he answered, 'No, I think they would oppose it, just as many bishops oppose it. But if it could be put into practice, I think they would accept it.' ... Before the Council ended, the Commission for the Implementation of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy had already approved of three distinct Mass formulas on a limited experimental basis, in which the entire Mass, including the Canon, was to be said aloud, in the vernacular, with the priest facing the people. A part of Bishop Duschak's proposal was already being put into practice."

All, mind you, because "the people" wanted it!

--P.H.O.

(To be concluded)

*****

INTERDVM is published occasionally. Subscription rate : $5 for eight consecutive issues. Foreign orders (Canada excepted) add $3.50 for air mail service; otherwise by surface mail.

Please address all correspondence to: Patrick Henry Omlor, Box R, Menlo Park, California 94025.

EXTRA COPIES OF THIS ISSUE ... One copy for 50¢; 3 for $1; 12 for $3; 25 for $4; 50 for $6; 100 for $11. These prices include postage and handling. All must go to the same address.

NOTICE: Due to a specially ordered reprinting, we now have in stock a small number of copies of Issues 1-4. Orders for these will be handled and filled as long as the supply lasts; for these the new increased rates for extra copies (given just above) also apply. We are out of Issue #5. A recent reprinting (the third one) of Issue #6 now makes plenty of this issue available again.

Those who order one issue at a time please put 8¢ postage per copy on self-addressed envelopes.

"I T C A N ' T H A P P E N H E R E"

There is a certain "argument" (if you can call it that) which some persons occasionally raise against those who believe that the "English Mass" is invalid. For the very reason that this "argument" is not based on reason, nor on theology, nor on logic, etc., but is based solely on emotion, it is perhaps the most difficult one to answer. Advanced chiefly by laypersons, this "argument" is, pure and simple, that so dreadful a thing as the Mass being taken away couldn't conceivably happen. "It is too impossible to be true," they say. Besides, this change in the Consecration Form from "many" to "all men" is really not significant. It is so slight a change, so imperceptible almost. What these persons cannot bring themselves to accept is that most of the "services" in the erstwhile Catholic churches are just that, namely, "services," and not the offering of the True Sacrifice.

On so ominous a day, when an invalid "Mass" would be introduced, surely there would be convulsions of nature, and most likely the sun would fail to shine. But the sun has continued to shine every day, the church bells continue to ring, and the People of God continue to attend their services. In many cases, moreover, definite appearances of outward devotion and piety continue to be manifest : some persons continue to recite the Rosary, some still pray the Magnificat, some priests even continue to give good "solid" sermons. So many Catholics continue to act, look, and comport themselves as devout Catholics, -- could so many persons be deceived? Take, for example, the pastor. Despite his faults and his many recent compromises, surely such a venerable man, so long a priest, could not fall so low as to be saying invalid Masses! No, it just cannot be true!

Of course, the Mass was once deliberately destroyed by some Satan-directed Innovators in England. But that was long ago and far away. It can't happen here. And besides, that time in England it was done by trickery; the people wouldn't have stood for it, had they known what was happening. No, it can't happen here.

Let us hear the words of Cardinal Henry Edward Manning, second Archbishop of Westminster, who died in 1892. From The Blessed Sacrament, the Centre of Immutable Truth :

> "For where the Blessed Sacrament is not, all dies. As when the sun departs all things sicken and decay, and when life is gone the body returns to dust; so with any province or member of the Church. There was a time when the truth and grace which went out from Canterbury and York spread throughout the whole of England, and bound it together in a perfect unity of faith and communion... There was but one jurisdiction reigning over all the people of England, guiding them by a divine voice of changeless faith, and sanctifying them by the Seven Sacraments of grace.
>
> "But then the grand old churches were the majestic tabernacles of the Word made Flesh. Jesus dwelt there in the Divine Mystery of the Holy Eucharist. His presence radiated on every side, quickening, sustaining, upholding the perpetual unity of His Mystical Body."
>
> "Then came a change, slight indeed, to sense, but, in the sight of God, fraught with inexhaustible consequences of supernatural loss. Does any one know the name of the man who removed the Blessed Sacrament from the cathedral of Canterbury, or from York Minster? Is it written in history? or is it blotted out from the knowledge of men, and known only to God and His holy angels? Who did it, and when it was done I cannot say. Was it in the morning, or in the evening? Can we hope that some holy priest, in sorrow, yielding to the violence of the storm then falling upon the Church, out of love to his Divine Master, removed His Eucharistical Presence to save it from profanation; or was it some sacrilegious hand that dragged Him from His throne, as of old He was dragged from Gethsemane to Calvary?
>
> "We cannot know. It was a terrible deed; and that name, if it be recorded, has a terrible brand upon it. But a change which held both on earth and in heaven had been accomplished. Canterbury and York went on the day after as the day before. But the Light of Life had gone out of them. Men were busy as not knowing or not believing what was done, and what would follow from the deed. There was no Holy Sacrifice offered morning by morning. The Scriptures were read there, but there was no Divine Teacher to interpret them. The Magnificat was chanted still, but it rolled along the empty roofs, for Jesus was no longer on the altar. So it is to this day. There is no light, no tabernacle, no altar, nor can be till Jesus shall return thither. They stand like the open sepulchre, and we may believe that angels are there, ever saying, 'He is not here. Come and see the place where the Lord was laid.'
>
> "But this is not all. The change, so imperceptible to sense, in the supernatural order is potent and irresistible. The centre of the order of grace had been taken away, and the whole had lost its unity and coherence. ... Straightway all began to dissolve and go to pieces. The sinews relaxed and lost their tenacity, the joints and bands of what had been the Mystical Body parted asunder."